



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,659	09/07/2006	Fiona Campbell	007193-19 US	2462
36234 7590 06/09/2010 THE MCCALLUM LAW FIRM, P. C. 685 BRIGGS STREET PO BOX 929 ERIE, CO 80516				
EXAMINER				
SOROUSH, ALI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1616				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/567,659

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

ALI SOROUSH

Art Unit

1616

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59 and 60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59 and 60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01282010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement of Receipt

Applicant's response filed on 02/16/2010 to the Office Action mailed on 10/14/2009 is acknowledged.

Status of the Claims

Claims 5, 13-36, 42, 51, and 58 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 are currently pending examination for patentability.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous Office Action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections and/or objections presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Applicant Claims
2. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
3. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casswall et al. (Bovine Anti-Helicobacter pylori Antibodies for Oral Immunotherapy, Published 2002) in view of Burggraber et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0180381 A1, Published 09/25/2003) and as evidenced by Dial et al. (Antibiotic Properties of Bovine Lactoferrin on Helicobacter pylori, Published 1998) **is maintained**.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims method of inhibiting bacterial colonization of mucous epithelium, reducing bacterial infection of mucous epithelium, reducing damage to mucous epithelium associated with bacterial infection, and method for treating a disease or condition associated with bacterial infection of mucous epithelium by administering a composition comprising a mucolytic agent and a milk product. Applicant further claims the aforementioned composition.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Casswall et al. teach, "An anti-H. pylori bovine colostral hyperimmune immunoglobulin preparation (BIC) was generated and its efficacy was tested in different in vitro experiments ..." (See abstract). "Milk or colostrum from cows immunized with different antigens has previously been shown to be an effective and safe source of orally administered antibodies for both prophylaxis and therapy ... Hence, we produced

a bovine immunoglobulin colostral preparation (BIC), which was used in therapeutic experiments in a *H. pylori* mouse model." (See page 1380, column 2, Lines 11-19 and page 1381, column 1, Lines 1-2). "The ability of the BIC to block the binding of *H. pylori* to gastric tissue in situ was compared with other bovine colostrum Ig preparations." (See page 1381, column 1, Lines 9-13). "The BIC preparation was then compared with a control preparation from non-immunized cows for its inhibition of binding of *H. pylori* to human gastric mucosa in situ. Almost 90% of blocking was observed when 0.1 mg/mL of the BIC was preincubated with *H. pylori* before incubation with human gastric mucosa tissue sections. BIC (1mg/mL) completely blocked the binding." (See page 1382, column 2, Lines 39-47). Caswell et al. further teach, "Much interest is currently focused on *Helicobacter pylori* infection and its association with development of gastritis, peptic ulcers and gastric malignancies in humans." (See page 1380, column 1, Lines 1-4). Caswell et al. conclude that "Bovine colostral antibodies against *H. pylori* can be generated in high titres, inhibit binding in vitro and can eradicate or reduce the number of bacteria in infected mice." (See abstract).

Dial et al. teach that bovine colostrum contains lactoferrin which has antibiotic properties against *H. pylori*. (See title and page 2754, column 2, Lines 10-14).

***Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims
(MPEP §2141.012)***

The therapeutic composition taught by Casswall et al. lacks a teaching wherein the composition comprises acetylcysteine as the mucolytic agent. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Bruggraber et al.

Bruggraber et al. teach, "Cobalt salts have been found to be particularly effective against *H. pylori* and may therefore be used to treat gastrointestinal infection with this bacteria ... Treatment with the cobalt salts may be carried out at the same time as conventional treatment with an antibiotic and/or proton pump inhibitor." (See abstract). "The cobalt ions may be used together with one or more agents which facilitate targeting together with one or more agents which facilitate targeting to the mucous layer. For example, the cobalt salt may be used together with agents selected from the group consisting of ... mucolytic agents (such as acetylcysteine, guaiphensin or ammonium citrate) ..." (See paragraph 0035). Bruggraber et al. further teach that one common conventional treatment used on *H. pylori* infection is complex triple therapies based on lansoprazole, amoxicillin, and metronidazole. (See paragraph 0019).

***Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP §2142-2143)***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add the bovine colostral hyperimmune immunoglobulin preparation taught by Casswall et al. to the treatment composition taught by Bruggraber et al., as suggested by Bruggraber et al., and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Bruggraber et al. teach that the treatment with cobalt may be carried out at the same time as conventional treatment. Casswall et al. teach that BIC has the ability to inhibit binding of *H. pylori* to gastric mucosa. Therefore, the combined compositions have the additive effect of treating gastrointestinal infections.

It is the Examiners position that the combination of a cobalt salt, acetylcysteine, and the antibiotic therapy (lansoprazole, amoxicillin, and metronidazole) taught by Bruggarber et al. could be combine with hyperimmune colostrum therapy of Casswall et al. to give an additive effect in treating H. pylori infections of the gastrointestinal mucosa, including associated diseases such as peptic ulcers.

The examiner notes that Dial et al. teach that colostrum has lactoferrin. Therefore, it is implicit to the BIC that it also contains an amount of lactoferrin.

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Applicant's Argument

Applicant argues that there is no teaching or suggestion that N-acetylcysteine would enhance the anti-bacterial nature of the hyperimmune colostrums. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. Burggraber et al. teach that the mucolytic agents such as N-acetylcysteine would facilitate targeting of (other agents to the mucous layer)idiomatic. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that addition of a mucolytic agent to the composition of Casswall et al.

would provide added activity. Furthermore, Applicant's claims do not recite any limitation with regards to enhanced activity due to N-acetylcysteine.

Applicant further argues that there is no teaching or suggestion that a mucolytic agent is useful for reduction of bacterial colonization. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. The instant claims are not directed to a mucolytic agent that has the capability to reduce bacterial colonization but to a composition comprising both a mucolytic agent and lactoferrin. Casswall et al. teach that a lactoferrin composition has an ability to reduce bacterial colonization. The addition of a mucolytic agent as taught by Burggraber et al. would provide for an additive effect in treating H. pylori infection of the gastrointestinal tract. For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.

1.132 Declaration

With regard to the Declaration submitted by Dr. Tran, Applicant has provided no side by side experimental data of the closest prior art to show unexpected results. Applicant asserts that it was surprising to him that the addition acetylcysteine improved bacterial-inhibition by hyperimmune colostrum. As discussed above it is the Examiners position that Burggraber et al. teach that acetylcysteine has some utility in treating H. pylori infection of the gastrointestinal tract, therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art that addition of acetylcystein to hyperimmune colostrum would result in an additive effect in treating H. pylori infection. For a proper side by side comparison, Applicant should provide data showing a synergistic effect in the addition of

acetylcysteine to hyperimmune colostrum over the range of concentrations Applicant is claiming. For the foregoing reasons, the Declaration is found unpersuasive

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Soroush whose telephone number is (571) 272-9925. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 5:00pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ali Soroush
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1616

/Johann R. Richter/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616